**Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee**

Approved Minutes

Friday, February 4th, 2022 9:00AM – 11:00AM

CarmenZoom

**Attendees**: Bitters, Cody, Coleman, Craigmile, Daly, Fletcher, Fredal, Hilty, Hruska, Hsu, Jeffries, Jenkins, Lam, Martin, Nathanson, Panero, Romero, Rush, Samuels, Staley, Steele, Vankeerbergen, Vasey, Wilson

1. First bookend (guest: Meg Daly)
   * Daly: Thank you for your feedback, we have addressed contingencies one and two from the feedback sent to us by the ASCC. They were items that were planned on the course syllabus, but we simply hadn’t the chance to fully incorporate them into the syllabus. As for involving the Multicultural Center, we have already connected with several colleagues in the University community to ensure that we have a robust course that does not duplicate the materials found elsewhere, such as in University Survey.
   * Committee Member comment: The reason we recommended including the folks from the Multicultural Center is to ensure that the Land-Grant Institution lessons are integrated appropriately and successfully engaging issues of DEI in a respectful manner. Additionally, we are curious as to why DEI is not explicitly connected to the REGD portion of the GE in the course?
     + Daly: Thank you for that context, it is incredibly useful for me. To answer your question, one reason that we decided to connect DEI early in the course is because that is when we introduce all portions of the new GE. The centrality of the Foundation: REGD and Theme: Citizenship to the new GE and how they are thematically and intentionally linked to DEI will be explored early on to help students get acquainted with these ideas early in their program. Additionally, a challenge that we have had to look at regarding this course, simply put, “is this the place for these conversations?”. The answer is yes, in the sense that this is the opportunity we are guaranteed to have in front of all students but we also must recognize that this is a one-credit hour course that must also meet and engage with the ELOs designed for the course.
   * Committee Member question: Would it be possible to redesign the course calendar to have sections such as “REGD” or “Citizenship” to introduce students to specific aspects of the new GE and to give students a way to understand what these categories are and how they connect with each other?
     + Daly: I think we are going to need to revisit the course calendar and schedule and do some tweaking, but I would like to ensure that we give the original faculty team credit. While I find immense value in the feedback from the ASCC, I also need to ensure that the original development team’s work is incorporated fully and respectfully.
   * Committee Member question: Can we talk about faculty member participation in the bookend course?
     + Daly: I would like to mention a few points regarding faculty member participation. There have consistently been two components of faculty-led participation in the bookend creation process: Faculty-led creation of the course and faculty involvement within the course. As for faculty involvement, it has been a tricky issue because we will be running one hundred or more sections of this course every semester, and therefore, if one faculty member was to commit one hour to each section, that would be approximately two and a half work weeks each semester to visit each section. Therefore, we decided the faculty videos were the best solution in order to allow students to interact and see different types of faculty. Additionally, it was suggested we use one faculty per section, but that would require one hundred or more different faculty and the issue of accountability comes into play – what if, for whatever reason, a faculty member is unable to attend their section?
     + Committee member question: We agree that it is not practical without a massive input of resources that the University is simply not prepared to invest. As for the videos, is there a mechanism in place to cycle through and update the videos to keep them relevant and fresh to students?
     + Daly: Yes, but currently the challenge is we must film outdoors due to masking requirements and we want these to be unmasked videos. We expect to have the desired amount of videos in about two years, and we will plan to cycle through and create new videos on a three-to-five year cycle.
   * Committee Member question: While the conversation around the videos is important, I’d like to turn back to live faculty interaction. Does the provided plan of having students visit an instructor’s office hours seem impactful? Additionally, was the idea of having live, faculty talks considered, where students would sign up and attend and faculty members would only need to contribute one hour of their time?
     + Daly: This was considered, however the concern was that if it wasn’t small and targeted, it would be akin to watching a live TedTalk and this does not align to the goals of the course.
2. Approval of 01/21/2022 Minutes
   * Rush, Fredal, **unanimously approved**
3. Informational Items (Luke Wilson)
   * Microbiology B.S. updates
     + The Microbiology B.S. degree is streamlining and accommodating itself to the new General Education program by removing a physics pre-requisite, requiring a specific Statistics course to fulfill their Embedded Literacy: Data Analysis requirement, and removing the pre-requisite of Microbiology 4100 to any student that earns an A or A- in Microbiology 4000.01 or 4000.02.
   * AuD Program updates
     + The AuD program is consolidating SPHHRNG 6766 and SPHHRNG 7820 to a 4-credit hour SPHHRNG 6850, removing SPHHRNG 5785 from the curriculum, converting SPHHRNG 6786 to Statistics from Research Methods and adding SPHHRNG 7825 to the curriculum.
   * Martin: Additionally, and as a quick update, the Embedded Literacy information collected is at CAA for approval and I do not foresee any hurdles with receiving approval utilizing the information we have solicited from programs.
4. Panel Updates
   * Arts and Humanities 1
     + Education: Teaching & Learning 2367 – approved
     + English 3011.01 – approved
     + Music 2032S – approved with contingency
     + Religious Studies 3671– approved
     + SASIA 2230 – approved
     + SASIA 3671 – approved
   * Arts and Humanities 2
     + Music 2249 – approved
     + Music 3340 – approved
     + Music 7815 – approved
     + Russian 5200 – approved
   * Social and Behavioral Sciences
     + ASC 1411 – approved with contingency
     + Geography 4103 – approved with contingency
   * Natural and Mathematical Sciences
     + Mathematics 6131 – approved
   * Assessment
     + SPHHRNG 5732 – approved with contingency
     + SPHHRNG 5760 – approved with contingency
   * Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity
     + AAAS 2270 – approved
     + Comparative Studies 2995 – approved
     + ESHESA 2577 – approved with contingency
     + ESPHE 3206 – approved
     + History of Art 3010 – approved
     + Slavic 2995.99 – approved
   * Themes
     + AAAS 5650 – approved with contingency
     + English 2277 – approved with contingency
     + English 3031 – approved with contingency
     + History 2703 – approved with contingency
     + History 3708 – approved with contingency
     + Pharmacy 3708 – approved with contingency
     + Public Health 2010 – approved
     + Public Health 2010H – approved
     + Public Health: Epidemiology 2410 – approved
5. Discussion about lower/upper-level courses in Colleges of Arts and Sciences (case of cross-listed EEOB, Earth Science and History 1911 requesting to become 2911)
   * Vankeerbergen: The situation we find ourselves in is that at semester conversion, the faculty rules regarding lower division and upper division courses were reapproved. This means that courses numbered at the 3000+ level or higher are considered upper division courses, with the exception of the mathematical and physical sciences counting their courses at the 2000+ level or higher and a few other carve outs. Digging through the minutes from the Committee’s decision at semester conversion, specifically regarding the mathematical and physical science decision, they agreed that this made sense given that very difficult physics courses and Organic Chemistry were placed at the 2000-level. Now, however, we have a course that is asking to be 2000-level and cross-listed, where the students enrolled in the Earth Science section will receive upper division credit while the students enrolled in the History and EEOB section will not, even though this is the same course. This cannot be the case, so now the ASCC will need to make a decision on how we proceed from here.
   * Committee Member question: What is the standard we use to determine what is upper- and lower-division?
     + Committee member comment: Currently, there are no clear-cut guidelines that we use. Typically, you just know what would be advanced in your discipline and use that as a general guideline.
   * Committee Member question: Would it be appropriate to simply have the proposal move to the 3000-level to solve the issue?
     + Committee Member comment: Yes, I believe this may work for this proposal but it does not change that this issue will likely come up again, especially with the encouragement to develop team-taught, interdisciplinary courses in the new General Education program.
   * Due to time, and to allow for further consideration, the Committee decided to table this conversation to a later date.